DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 709 HE 019 194

TITLE Moral and Ethical Development on the College Campus. A Symposium.
INSTITUTION Bowling Green State Univ., Ohio.
PUB DATE Dec 85
NOTE 25p.; For related document, see HE 019 193.
AVAILABLE FROM Bowling Green State University, Institutional Studies, Bowling Green, OH 43403.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; College Environment; College Faculty; College Role; *College Students; Conferences; Curriculum Development; Deans; *Ethical Instruction; Ethics; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Moral Development; *Outcomes of Education; *Student Development; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; Values; Values Clarification; *Values Education
IDENTIFIERS *Bowling Green State University OH

ABSTRACT

Issues concerning student moral and ethical development during college are considered in three papers from a symposium sponsored by Bowling Green State University as part of the Academic Outcomes Project. Four major questions are addressed: the college's role in promoting students' moral and ethical development; what constitutes moral and ethical development in young adults and adults in general; the degree to which this type of development occurs among college students; and what types of collegiate experiences promote or inhibit students' moral and ethical development. After an introduction by Patricia M. King, a paper by John M. Whiteley is presented: "The Development of Values and Ethics During the College Years." Attention is directed to the Sierra Project, which is a longitudinal study of the effects of a new approach to character education, and the character development of students during college. Three ways to respond to forces that push education to specialization are proposed by Thomas Klein in "Moral Development: A Faculty Member's Perspective." Ideas for faculty development, curriculum monitoring and change, and faculty renewal are included. Finally, in "Opportunities to Promote Moral Development: A Dean's Perspective," Donald Schweingruber discusses seven steps to promote student moral development. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James L. Litwin
Office of Inst. Stud.
Bowling Green State
University

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	3
Introduction: Moral Development on the College Campus *Dr. Patricia M. King, Chair* *Symposium Planning Committee* *Bowling Green State University*	5
The Development of Values and Ethics During the College Years *Dr. John M. Whiteley* *University of California, Irvine*	7
Moral Development: A Faculty Member's Perspective *Dr. Thomas Klein* *Bowling Green State University*	17
Opportunities to Promote Moral Development: A Dean's Perspective *Dr. Donald Schweingruber* *Bluffton College*	21
References	24

Special acknowledgements are given to the Department of College Student Personnel, the Division of Student Affairs and the University Human Relations Commission at Bowling Green State University for their generous support of the Symposium.

FOREWORD

The moral and ethical development of college students is a worrisome concept for many colleges and universities. Most administrators and faculty members feel some such development (however vaguely defined) ought to occur; that is, colleges and universities should probably contribute to students' understanding of right and wrong, or at least how to consider such questions. However, faculty and staff members are often unsure about how to approach the topic, or exactly how far their explicit association with it should go. The current talk of "values analysis" and "moral reasoning" seem to be acceptable approaches. But many people still remain ambivalent about taking responsibility for this particular domain of college outcomes.

The Academic Outcomes Project at Bowling Green State University was created to conduct a series of investigations aimed at gaining a better understanding of the effect of the University experience on students. The Project is intended to develop useful answers to problematic questions associated with the growth and development of students. The maintenance of a University dialogue through a series of reports, workshops and symposia is part of the Project. The first of these symposia resulted in the publication of an earlier monograph on student intellectual development.

This second monograph in the series is based on a symposium focused on the moral and ethical development of college students. Dr. Patricia King chaired the planning committee for the symposium and her thoughtful introduction outlines the important questions to be addressed by the speakers.

Dr. John Whiteley offered the centerpiece for the symposium. His research on the character development of college students is well known through his writings on the Sierra Project, a residentially-based curriculum at the University of California, Irvine. Dr. Whiteley's presentation is an excellent primer for grasping the complexity of research on student development.

The remarks presented by Dr. Thomas Klein, a faculty member at BGSU, and by Dr. Donald Schweingruber, Dean of Students at Bluffton College, were prepared as critiques of Dr. Whiteley's work. However, they both go far beyond supplying reactions and provide rich commentaries on how faculty and student affairs professionals can affect student growth. Dr. Schweingruber clearly makes the case that while such programs as the Sierra Project are most worthwhile and productive, the absence of them on our campus does not excuse us from considering the many opportunities we have everyday to be of consequence to students.

Dr. James Litwin
Director of Institutional Studies

INTRODUCTION: MORAL DEVELOPMENT ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

Dr. Patricia M. King
Chair, Symposium Planning Committee

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you to our Symposium on the Development of Values and Ethics in the College Years.

Our symposium today addresses a topic which is of great interest and concern to many segments of the academic community. It is appropriate, then, that the sponsorship of this symposium does reflect a cross section of our University:

the Department of College Student Personnel;
the Division of Student Affairs;
Institutional Studies; and
the University Human Relations Commission

I'd like to open our symposium by reviewing the four major questions that will be addressed.

1. What is the role of the university regarding students' moral and ethical development?
2. What constitutes moral and ethical development in young adults as well as adults in general?
3. To what degree does this type of development occur among college students?
4. What types of collegiate experiences promote or inhibit the moral and ethical development of college students?

McBee (1980) has argued that higher education has an explicit responsibility to transmit moral and ethical values. She notes:

> "In a society that depends for its strength on free citizens who must be able to make difficult moral choices, we need to find ways to assist and prepare them for these tasks. In higher education, we have some eleven million students in our trust. Lawyers, doctors, teachers, businessmen [and women], political and other leaders pass through our colleges and professional schools. Decisions about 'What is the good,' 'What is worth doing,' and 'What is worth striving for?' are implicit in every human endeavor. An educated person should be able to consider and judge evidence, examine assumptions, evaluate and prefer one thing over another and know why, and have values that are his [or her] own and that are developed logically and rationally. Higher education must play a role in this development" (p. 1).

There is certainly no shortage of opportunities for students, faculty or staff members to confront moral dilemmas and to ask ourselves: "What is the right thing to do here?" "What are the implications of taking this stand instead of that one?" "What are the implications of choosing not to respond at all?" Whether these questions are being raised in respect to a plagiarism incident, sexual or racial harassment, date rape, arbitrary grading practices or governance policies that are inconsistent or insensitive, two major questions are at the crux of these issues:

1. What does a university as a community stand for? What are the values and ideals to which we purport to be committed?

As John Gardner (1970) has reminded us,

> "We have in the tradition of this nation a well-tested framework of values: justice, liberty, equality of opportunity, the worth and dignity of the individual, brotherhood, and individual responsibility...Our problem is not to find better values, but to be faithful to those we profess and to make them live in our institutions" (p. 131).

2. How do students (and faculty and staff, for that matter) learn to understand these values as guiding principles, to endorse them, and to allow them to serve as personal codes of conduct in guiding their behavior? In other words,

what is the process by which personal character is developed?

For help in answering this question for those in higher education, I turn from philosophy to psychology and our old friend, John Dewey (who so often helps make the leap between these two disciplines). As Dewey noted in 1895,

> "Only psychology and ethics can take education out of the rule-of-thumb stage and elevate the school to a vital, effective institution in the greatest of all constructions — *the building of a free and powerful character*... Education is precisely the work of *supplying the conditions* which will enable (the student to mature) in the freest and fullest manner" (in Archambault, 1964, pp. 207-208).

Our keynote speaker today has considerable experience with questions of character development and learning how to "supply the conditions" that help it thrive. He is an educator, a counseling psychologist and administrator. Dr. John Whiteley was recently the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at the University of California, Irvine, and is currently Professor of Social Ecology and Social Sciences. He is the founding editor of *The Counseling Psychologist*, and has continued in this capacity for the past 15 years. He has recently published the first of a three-volume series entitled *Character Development in College Students*.

Following his presentation, we will hear responses from two other educators: Dr. Don Schweingruber, Dean of Students at Bluffton College, and Dr. Thomas Klein, Professor of English at Bowling Green State University.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VALUES AND ETHICS DURING THE COLLEGE YEARS

Dr. John M. Whiteley
University of California, Irvine

The development of values and ethics during the college years has a venerable tradition in America. From the statements of purpose of the earliest colleges founded in colonial times to the role assigned by society to the multiversities of the Twentieth Century, there has been an expectation that components of the experiences which students have during the college years would contribute to their personal as well as to their professional development. In the decades since World War II, the period of rapid expansion of higher education at the community college, state college, and university levels has been accompanied by an extraordinary explosion of knowledge about college students, their growth tasks during the college years, and the effects of intervention programs designed to enhance components of personal development.

Nowhere has progress been as promising as in the domain of value and ethical developments. This progress has occurred in both theory development and theory measurement. In previous years, reflecting the general status of psychological and educational theory and measurement, promising constructs for understanding the course of human development had not yet become imbedded in general theory, and the development of instrumentation was in its infancy.

At this point in time, however, it is now possible to accomplish a number of tasks central to promoting value and ethical development which have heretofore not been within the capacity of teachers and researchers. It is now possible to enhance the power of the impact of the educational experience of college students by:

1. Assessing accurately the psychological and educational status of students on a host of significant developmental dimensions;
2. Charting change in students over time using the initial assessment as a base;
3. Identifying developmentally relevant curricula which will produce desired change;
4. Sequencing educational experiences within that curricula in such a manner as to optimize their impact; and
5. Determining the portion of student development which is attributable to maturation and that which is attributable differentially to the effects of the curricula.

This presentation will outline an approach to promoting value and ethical development, and present a rationale for the incorporation of work such as this into the mainstream of higher education.

A RATIONALE FOR THE SIERRA PROJECT

The Sierra Project, the focus of this presentation, seeks to influence the development of college students on dimensions of character. The Sierra Project is a longitudinal study of: 1) the effects of a new approach to character education, and 2) the character development of students during the college years.

In the past decade there has been a veritable explosion of knowledge about the psychological and intellectual development of college students, and the role which colleges and universities can have in influencing the course of that development. New insights have come principally from a series of research studies conducted throughout the country which have their theoretical bases in developmental and counseling psychology.

These studies have been conducted in an educational and psychological terrain previously charted by three different types of studies: those on the impact of college experience, those on the psychological development of college students, and those on the

developmental stages which characterize the shift from late adolescence to early adulthood.

Closely related to this latter line of studies is the research in recent years which has examined the notion of sequencing educational experiences based upon the developmental level of the student. This inquiry is based on what is known as cognitive-developmental theory originating with the work of Piaget (1948, 1960).

The focus of the curriculum development and research evaluation which is reported herein is on one domain within the cognitive-developmental tradition: character development as it encompasses the constructs of principled thinking, moral maturity, and ego development. There is a broader concern, however, relating back to the genesis of scholarly inquiry into the interaction between college students and universities: that of the impact of the college experience on students, and on the growth tasks which college students are confronting in the transition from late adolescence to early adulthood.

The research focus of the Sierra Project is directed to understanding the individual, and then to his or her relationship to others in the university setting. A description of the context (physical, social, and psychological) in which that individual is developing is an adjunct to an analysis of the wholeness of a life in the process of attaining adulthood in our society.

THE RATIONALE FOR CHARACTER EDUCATION DURING THE COLLEGE YEARS

The Sierra Project presents a curriculum designed to develop in university students a greater capacity for ethical sensitivity and awareness, an increased regard for equity in human relationships, and the ability to translate this enhanced capacity and regard into a higher standard of fairness and concern for the common good in all realms of their lives. These accomplishments are viewed as ultimately self-rewarding. Their development constitutes a central rationale for the Sierra Project effort at character education. There is, however, a second rationale which is to be found in the benefit to society of a citizenry whose lives are characterized by principled thinking and moral maturity. Such individuals will be more responsible citizens, leaders, participants, and parents.

Personal growth and psychological maturity are closely related to many dimensions of accomplishment in adulthood (Sprinthall, Bertin, and Whiteley, 1982). The Sierra Project's approach to character education emphasizes ego development *and* the achievement of a higher level of moral reasoning in order to produce general personal growth and psychological maturity in interpersonal relationships. Therefore, a third rationale for the Sierra Project is in the ultimate benefit to its participants throughout their adult lives in terms of greater potential for accomplishment.

The fourth rationale for the Sierra Project is the impact of moral and psychological education programs on the level of moral reasoning and ego development of junior high school, high school, and college students. The evidence is conclusive that properly sequenced educational and psychological experiences raise the level of moral reasoning and ego development of adolescents and young adults. This research is extraordinarily hopeful in its implications: for society, education can make a difference in the moral reasoning of the citizenry.

Inquiry into devising curricula for character education, however, is in its infancy. Research has just begun on the crucial problem of determining the optimal match between the developmental level of students and the sequencing of educational experiences. Nonetheless, the legacy of the past decade is one of documenting the extraordinary potential of our educational institutions for positively influencing the character of students.

The fifth rationale for the Sierra Project is the nature of the challenges addressed during the four years of undergraduate education. For perhaps the first time in their lives, college students are physically and psychologically autonomous from those who have previously been highly influential in their lives: parents and siblings, school-age chums, and high school teachers and friends. Since the vast majority of beginning college students reason in a highly conventional manner, their moral referents are those people immediately around them. It is to significant others and to the peer group that college students look for guidance in formulating their thinking about ethical issues. Homogeneity of influence predominated in high school. The typical college environment, however, contains the opportunity for exposure to, and intellectual confrontation with, diversity in beliefs, lifestyles, and personality types. This is especially the case where there is a

coed, multicultural, and mixed socioeconomic population, as in the Sierra Project.

A further reason why the college years forcefully impact moral reasoning is the challenge of the growth tasks of late adolescence and early adulthood: securing identity, seeking intimacy, choosing enduring values, and initiating career and educational explorations of crucial significance. Each of these tasks contains the seeds of significant moral dilemmas. Their satisfactory resolution involves thoughtful moral choices. The extraordinary opportunity provided by the college years for impacting moral reasoning, therefore, is a fifth rationale for character education in the university.

A sixth rationale for the Sierra Project is a declarative statement about a central purpose of higher education, and about what should be provided as an educational challenge to the men and women of all ages who spend a vitally important segment of their lives studying and learning in colleges and universities. An experience in higher education should provide an opportunity to reflect on the purposes of learning, on the uses to which acquired knowledge is put, and on the ethical dilemmas which confront citizens individually and as members of society collectively. This is a viewpoint which considers an essential goal of a college education to be the cultivation of a capacity for reflection about, and analysis of, issues in society both of a personal and a political nature. While consistent with purposes of a college education as preparation for life and career, and as a time for personal development, this sixth rationale stresses the importance of achieving a capability for integrating these two aspects of experience during the college years. It is a statement that the opportunity to focus on the *process* of learning, to think carefully about questions of values and valuing, is vital to a well-rounded college education. All too often such an opportunity is insufficiently a part of the usual experience at college and university.

That distinguished philospher of higher education and the American scene, *Doonesbury*, presented a very similar rationale in one of the commencement address vignettes which Gary Trudeau has written on various occasions. In a 1972 cartoon in which the commencement speaker was addressing the assembled graduates, he commented with concern upon the students' "obsessive concern for the future," an approach which has been "the salient shaping influence on your attitudes during a very critical four years." He then went on to state eloquently our sixth rationale: "It could have been more than that. This college offered you a sanctuary, a place to experience PROCESS, to FEEL the present as you moved through it, to EMBRACE both the joys and sorrows of moral and intellectual maturation! It needn't have been just another way station."

THE CONTEXT OF THE SIERRA PROJECT

The Sierra Project was conducted at the University of California, Irvine. Since its founding in 1962, UCI has grown to over 12,000 students; it offers academic degrees from the B.A. through the Ph.D. and M.D.

During the years covered by the curriculum intervention (1975-1979), approximately 25 percent of undergraduates were housed on campus. A sense of on-campus community was difficult to achieve during these years. A student union, the University Center, was not completed until January 1981. The average commuter student drove 11 miles or more each way to school, and was part of on-campus life mainly between 9 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

The Sierra Project occurred in Sierra Hall, one of 23 undergraduate residence halls. This housing complex is considered by students to be a particularly attractive place to live. Sierra Hall houses 50 students in a comfortable wood, stucco, and glass two-story structure with two large common rooms shared by all Sierra residents. Students live in suites housing eight to ten students, each suite having its own living room.

Academically, the Sierra Project consisted of a four-unit, lower division course offered each quarter — Social Ecology 74: Moral Development and Just Communities. Students who elected to live in Sierra Hall did so with the understanding that they would concurrently enroll in this class. In addition, Sierra residents could elect a two-unit laboratory course which involved working at least five hours per week in a paraprofessional counseling or service role in the surrounding community. The curriculum intervention portion of the Sierra Project began with freshmen who entered UCI in the fall of 1975. Each class is hereafter referred to by its year of projected graduation and by group (e.g., Sierra students who entered in the fall of 1975 are referred to as the Sierra Class

of 1979).

PARTICIPANTS IN THE SIERRA PROJECT

The participants in the Sierra Project consisted of three groups of students from each of the Classes of 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982. Those three groups of students are the residents of Sierra Hall, the residents of Lago Hall (Control Group I), and the members of several other control groups (Control Group II).

Students in Sierra Hall (all freshmen) participated in the intervention and constituted our "experimental" group. Lago residents were also all freshmen living in an identical physical facility, with equal proportions of men and women. The major difference between these groups was that the Sierra freshmen had requested to participate in the intervention (including the academic class), whereas the Lago residents had not.

In order to provide a picture of the Sierra Project participants on dimensions of character, it is first necessary to briefly describe the three measures of character. The first, the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979), measures moral reasoning in terms of six stages and a P score (the percentage of principled thinking involved in making responses on the test). Our students fall in the expected range between senior high school students and college students. On the basis of this test, Sierra participants may be characterized as predominately conventional in their moral reasoning.

The second measure of character was the Moral Judgment Interview, developed by Kohlberg and his associates (Colby, Gibbs, Kohlberg, Speicher-Dubin and Candee, 1979) which assesses moral maturity. The level of moral reasoning illustrated by the MJI test scores indicates that Sierra students are very conventional thinkers. As a group, they are very closely clustered around Stage 3, Interpersonal Conformity. Students at the Interpersonal Conformity stage have an orientation toward making judgments in terms of the approval of those around them, particularly what "good boys" and "good girls" would do in a given situation.

Our final measure of character was ego development as assessed by the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (Loevinger and Wessler, 1970). On the measure of ego development, our students were clustered between Stages 1-3 and 1-3/4. Stage 1-3 represents thinking with a "simplistic conventionality" which fails to question the world. Stage 1-3/4 represents the transition from conformity to conscientiousness, where the individual can see multiple possibilities and alternatives. Loevinger and Wessler captured the distinctiveness of the 1-3 to 1-3/4 transition that characterizes entering Sierra Project students when they observed:

> "In place of the 1-3 tendency to classify actions in mutually exclusive categories of right and wrong, the 1-3/4 subject tends to think about appropriateness, what is right for the time and place and the situation. There are contigencies, exceptions, and comparisons, though they are global and often banal" (p. 17).

Sierra Project students — in terms of expectations for a sense of community and psychological factors — were quite homogeneous, and they were rather conventional on such dimensions of character as principled thinking, moral maturity, and ego development. They were also quite diverse in ethnic background, socioeconomic background, and verbal preparation for college. They differ as well on the range of their educational and occupational aspirations.

THE CURRICULUM OF THE SIERRA PROJECT

The Sierra Project was designed principally by psychologists, and implementation of the intervention was deeply rooted in the idea of psychologist as educator. The Project simply would have been quite different if it had been planned and implemented from another disciplinary perspective, though teaching character development skills and establishing a sense of community are not the sole province of psychology any more than that of any other discipline.

The intent of the original group that planned the Sierra Curriculum was to develop a series of discrete modules which could either be implemented singly or be presented in a sequential order. Interested educators could then use the entire program or select only those modules which served their particular instructional purposes. The modules relevant to character development as they were originally conceived are as follows:

Module 1 **Survival Skills:** teaching freshmen the learning skills which will help them succeed academically in the university: organizing their time, studying effectively, and preparing for examinations.

Module 2 **Community Building:** working together with students to create an atmosphere of openness, trust, and group support in an environment which encourages the resolution of conflict through democratic decision-making.

Module 3 **Empathy/Social Perspective-taking:** developing students' empathy — their ability to understand the point of another and to communicate that understanding — which involves basic listening and communication skills.

Module 4 **Conflict Resolution in Society:** encouraging student participation in SIMSOC, a commercially available simulation game in which students are given only a vaguely structured role and allowed to form their own society. As implemented in Sierra Hall, SIMSOC emphasizes survival issues, personal goals, problems of power and authority, and consideration of the type of society which will provide the most good for the most people — using principles of fairness and justice as well as conflict resolution skills.

Module 5 **Conceptions of Lifestyles:** helping students consider themselves and their lifestyle choices in relationship to how other people have chosen to live, with particular reference to different value choices and perspectives on the world.

Module 6 **Race-role Choices:** helping students consider differing race-role stereotypes in our society — and their impact on interpersonal relationships — as well as the bases of racial prejudice and lack of mutual understanding.

Module 7 **Sex-role Choices:** helping consider various sex-role expectations within society and the implications of these expectations for two-person relationships and for partnerships between men and women.

Module 8 **Assertion Training:** teaching students methods for identifying the personal rights involved in a conflict situation, and for resolving that situation in a way which assures one's own legitimate rights without violating those of others.

Module 9 **Community Service:** providing students with the opportunity to apply the skills they have been learning in Sierra to a social-action setting in the community, allowing them to have positive contact with agencies outside the university community while still receiving support from the campus.

The basic intervention has been influenced profoundly by the fact that it occurred within the context of a residence hall. Community as it developed was enhanced by the 24-hour day living arrangement; the hours per week devoted to the formal class were few by comparison. If the Sierra Project had been administered to commuter rather than to residential students, the psychological intervention would have been relegated to a much smaller portion of a freshman's time and attention. We doubt that the Sierra curriculum would have had as great an impact as it did were it not for the level of community generated in the residence hall.

EVALUATION OF THE SIERRA PROJECT

The Sierra Project approach to evaluation was multifaceted, reflecting the complex nature of the project. The basic research questions were as follows:

1. Did the Sierra Project intervention produce changes? If so, did those changes endure?
2. Did certain parts of the intervention, under particular conditions, produce specific identifiable developmental changes? If so, what were they?
3. Who benefited most from the intervention in our particular population of students?

4. What experiences had the most impact on students, particularly on their thinking about moral decisions?

Each of these basic questions was approached by a variety of different evaluation methods. A basic strength of this multidimensional approach to evaluation is that important aspects of the complexity of the Sierra Project can be captured and analyzed. Had we limited ourselves to only a few approaches to evaluation, we would have missed important data necessary for us to address central questions, to understand what students were experiencing, and to understand how they were changing.

CONSTRUCTS FOR UNDERSTANDING AND PROMOTING CHARACTER IN COLLEGE STUDENTS

In terms of understanding the development of character, it is essential to offer explanations of what we mean by "character," "character development," and "character education" and to describe the central constructs of character (moral reasoning and ego development). In terms of enhancing character development as part of the college experience, we will present certain constructs from counseling and developmental psychology which we have found relevant in the promotion of character development. Together, this group of psychological constructs have contributed to the theoretical foundation and presentation of the Sierra Project curriculum.

The curricular goal of the Sierra Project is the enhancement of character development. But what is character development? In formulating our definition of character development, we have sought one which has empirical referents in order that its application may be subjected to systematic inquiry. The terms "Character" and "character development" in common usage have been known historically to convey very different meanings, just as the training of such "character" (character education) has been confronted by the dilemma of determining which approaches to education offer the most promise for developing value systems which enhance the "common good." Given the confusion stemming from the various connotations of character, it is of obvious importance for developmental interventions such as the Sierra Project to be clear about the conceptual usages chosen for character, character development, and character education.

Character, as we have defined it conceptually, has two parts. The first part refers to an understanding of what is the right, fair, or good thing to do in a given circumstance. The second part refers to the ability to do those things (the courage to act in accordance with one's understanding of what is right, fair, and good). Thus, character constitutes *understanding* what is right and *acting* on what is right. Current research and instrument development presently focus on two particular components of character: moral reasoning and ego development. Although this is a comparatively narrow empirical definition of character, it does focus on how individuals think about moral issues and how they *may* act in different situations, rather than on how they *actually* behave.

Character development, as we have conceptually defined it, refers to the progression of an individual's capacity for understanding what is right or good in increasingly complex forms and to the willingness or courage to act on those conceptions. Our emphasis in the Sierra Project is on understanding internal (intrapsychic) progression through a maturing individual's interaction with others and through the environment during the transition from late adolescence to early adulthood.

The approach to character education that we have chosen to work with is the cognitive-developmental model. We consider this model to be more representative of the definition of character and more sensitive to the progression of changes within individuals over time. This choice reflects our judgment that the developmental model captures with greater complexity and accuracy the true nature of this aspect of the human experience.

CENTRAL CONSTRUCTS OF CHARACTER: MORAL REASONING AND EGO DEVELOPMENT

The central constructs of character for the Sierra Project are moral reasoning (principled thinking and moral maturity) and ego development. Both constructs and the approaches to measuring them rely on the theoretical development and empirical

research which has progressed dramatically in the past several decades. Piaget began the original formulations by observing and recording the complexity of mental operations; his particular contribution was to document the cognitive constructions utilized in making sense of experience and how these constructions become elaborated in order to adequately comprehend more complex experiences. Understanding and explaining this process is the heart of cognitive-developmental psychology.

Thinking in the cognitive-developmental framework is assumed to progress through a series of hierarchical stages which occur in an invariant sequence. There is an underlying organization to the thinking within each stage, and between stages there are distinct and qualitative differences. More mature development consists of progressing through successive stages of thinking, each more complex than the last.

Kohlberg's theory of moral development identifies six stages of development in moral reasoning. Loevinger's theory of development, includes seven discrete stages and two transitional periods of ego development. These are briefly summarized below.

Moral Reasoning

Kohlberg's six-stage conceptualization of an individual's moral development includes the following six stages:

Stage 1. Punishment and obedience orientation
Stage 2. Naive instrumental hedonism
Stage 3. Interpersonal concordance
Stage 4. "Law-and-order" orientation
Stage 5. Social-contract legalistic orientation
Stage 6. Universal ethical principle, or conscience, orientation

Ego Development

Loevinger also conceptualizes ego development as occurring in a number of stages, but, unlike Kohlberg, does not closely define each stage. Rather, she presents "impressionistic descriptions" of stages that are referred to by a name or a code symbol rather than by a number. Loevinger describes seven discrete stages of ego development, and two additional stages which she terms "transitional."

Pre-Social/Symbiotic
Impulsive
Self-protective
Conformist
Self-aware (transitional)
Conscientious
Individualistic (transitional)
Autonomous
Integrated

Taken together, Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development and Loevinger's theory of ego development are key psychological theories that facilitate an understanding of character development. As such, they form the theoretical foundation for the Sierra Project. In terms of actually planning and implementing the Sierra Project as an activity to promote change in the character of young people in the transition from late adolescence to early adulthood, we found seven additional constructs from developmental and counseling psychology to be relevant both in curriculum planning and delivery.

PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES RELEVANT TO PROMOTING CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

Seven psychological constructs were reviewed which have relevance to promoting character development. Four of these constructs primarily derive from developmental psychology, and three from counseling psychology.

Although this constellation of constructs has not been previously incorporated into developmental curricula such as the Sierra Project, we find them quite relevant to promoting character development in the transition from late adolescence to early adulthood. These constructs are: 1) structural organization of thinking; 2) developmental sequencing; 3) interactionism; 4) equilibration; 5) psychological sense of community;

6) empathy and social perspective taking; 7) assertion training. (See Whiteley and Associates, 1982, for an extended review of these constructs.)

THE PRINCIPAL FINDINGS CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHARACTER DURING THE COLLEGE YEARS

Freshman students as a group made a moderate and statistically significant gain ($p < .001$) in moral reasoning over the course of their first year of college study when the measure focused on their percentage of principled thinking. This gain was characteristic of all three classes studied. Gender of students did not influence the degree of change over the freshman year, even in the case of women in the Class of 1981, who entered scoring at a very high level. There were significant differences among the cohort groups in the percentage of their responses which were based on principled moral reasoning, men and women in the Class of 1981 both entering and leaving at a level higher than that of the other two classes ($p < .0003$). There were statistically highly significant ($p. < .00001$) changes for the entire sample (both genders combined for all classes). The Freshman pre-test sample had a combined mean of 36.94 in comparison with the Senior post-test sample which had a combined mean of 48.14. However, there were no significant class (cohorts of 1980, 1981, 1982) or gender differences in the degree of growth of principled thinking over four years of undergraduate study.

In addition to being a difference of major statistical significance, a change of twelve points on percentage on principled thinking is a finding of major theoretical and practical importance. It is a finding of theoretical importance because of the magnitude of the change during the college years. The college years have been determined to be a period of major growth in moral reasoning. It is a finding of practical importance to college educators: they are working with a portion of the general population which is making major changes on a significant dimension of the human condition; namely, growth on dimensions of character.

Principled thinking was the only measure of character (the others being moral maturity and ego development) which we were able to collect on the entire sample — the two control groups as well as the Sierra group. On this measure, Sierra residents exhibited greater change toward a higher level of moral reasoning than students in both control groups. The differences were moderate in size, with the Class of 1980 accounting for a large proportion of the positive change in Sierra scores. The conclusion we draw, however, is that the Sierra curriculum can make a moderate contribution toward furthering character development in college freshmen during a period in their lives which would normally include a moderate but persistent gain in level of moral reasoning.

CENTRAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE SIERRA PROJECT

A discussion of the central implications of the Sierra Project for higher education will focus on three aspects: the freshman year, the nature of undergraduate education, and higher education in general.

THE FRESHMAN YEAR

The freshman year has been found to be a period of moderate growth in the level of the principled thinking dimension of character. This growth occurred in freshmen who had a higher expectation for the sense of community which would be found at college. Uniformly, this high level of expectation was met with a lessened perceived reality of community. The reasons they stated for this situation were clear and unambiguous:

1. the intense competition from peers;
2. the psychological distance from faculty and staff; and
3. the perceived low level of community which existed on the UCI campus.

Residents of Sierra Hall reported *less* of a gap between what they expected and what they actually received. Given the emphasis the Sierra staff placed on developing a high level of community, the gap students report between the myth of community in higher education and the perceived reality of lack of community is noteworthy.

The residents of Sierra Hall did report they had experienced a higher level of com-

munity than did their peers in other living arrangements without the curriculum. The creation of a sense of community was viewed as a vital contributor to raising the level of moral reasoning. The basic notion is that it is possible to challenge students more intensely when that challenge occurs within a context of personal support. The lineage of such a notion is Nevitt Sanford's (1956; Sanford & Axeirod, 1979) pioneering work on student development in higher education.

The Sierra research design did not allow differential attribution of effects by components of the curriculum. Our impressions, substantiated by student retrospective report, are that the psychological sense of community was an important contributor to the most significant empirical finding to emerge from the freshman year curriculum intervention; namely, that the Sierra experimental group which experienced the curriculum increased on principled thinking twice as much as did the two control groups. This differential change attributable to the curriculum occurred in the context of freshmen as a whole making moderate positive change in their scores on the principled thinking measure of moral reasoning.

The freshman year *itself* turned out to be a catalyst for change. The psychological distance from previous support groups including parents and high-school chums, the opportunity for making important decisions, the consequences of increased personal autonomy from all authority, and the immersion in a new multicultural, coed educational culture all combined to create a catalyst for personal change in the crucible of the freshman year.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

The college years have been found to be a period of significant growth in the principled thinking dimension of character development. This growth was found to be both statistically significant and psychologically important.

There is perhaps no period in young people's lives when they are more open to new experiences *and* alternative ways of thinking about those experiences. In retrospective interviews, in detailed case studies, and in the context of regular interviewing throughout an academic year, students were nearly unanimous in reporting that they would not be who they had become if it were not for the college experience, especially on dimensions of thinking about moral issues. They did make one important qualifier: they had not changed as much as they had developed.

As we struggled to understand their meaning in using development in contrast to change, it seemed to us that they were expressing that the core of who they were had remained the same. It was their appreciation of the world of moral choices and their stance in relation to those choices that had become more acute and sensitive, and this was appropriately considered by them to be development.

The four year graduation rate for Sierra Hall students was sixty percent in contrast to the campus average of forty-four percent. This we attribute to two factors: the sense of community, and the closeness of relationships with significant faculty and staff during the freshman year. The sense of community contributed to a level of support which we view as highly significant. Students made enduring friendships during that first year which were nurtured in an environment of shared experiences and trust.

The chief effect on retention which close relationships with faculty and staff had in the freshman year was that students could and did make " connections" with the support structures of the university: the formal and informal academic advising structure, personalized advice on how to make the "system" work for them, and personal introductions to counseling, career planning, health, or faculty personnel. While such an entree may be an integral part of life on a liberal arts college campus, it is not in a research multiversity.

HIGHER EDUCATION

The central implications for higher education, beyond those covered in the sections on the freshman year and undergraduate education, are four: level of student interest, hospitality of campus, generalizability of the curriculum, and overall impact of higher education on character development.

First, students chose to participate in all levels of the Sierra Project with a willingness and enthusiasm beyond all our expectations.

Second, the university itself proved to be far more hospitable to the Sierra Project in-

intervention than we had imagined.

Third, the Sierra curriculum as it was implemented and reported provides a week-to-week road map of what we did, problems we encountered, and feedback we received. Others who choose to implement a character education program in higher education can obtain a full report on the curriculum (Loxley and Whiteley, in preparation).

It is a curriculum, however, tied in important respects to the freshman year of students in a research university who were highly conventional in terms of the theories of moral reasoning and ego development. Therefore, while the general presentation of character issues and the sequencing of educational experiences constitute a model we have found valid, the actual presentation of classes needs to be adapted to the developmental level of the student participants and the particular characteristics of the educational institution.

In adapting the curriculum to the requirements of different colleges and universities, it may be useful to keep in mind that in our assessment, the key components of the Sierra Project curriculum are as follows:

1. the psychological sense of community;
2. the presence of more mature role models in the residence halls;
3. the assertion training model which developed students' skills in identifying the rights of oneself and others and learning to resolve conflicts fairly;
4. the empathy training module which increased students' perceptions of how other people experience situations;
5. the greater responsibility for their educational experiences which was demanded of students;
6. the structured exercises which required students to rethink a number of previously unexamined beliefs; and
7. the consideration of sex roles and race roles which stimulated more complex thinking about ways of relating to other people.

We believe the provision of both moral and psychological educational experiences is essential.

Fourth, and most significantly, the Sierra Project demonstrated once again that education can make a difference in promoting what John Dewey called the development of a "free and powerful character." Consistent with an emerging number of research studies on different populations in diverse settings, the effect of formal education as a catalyst to significant moral growth was again demonstrated.

MORAL DEVELOPMENT: A FACULTY MEMBER'S PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Thomas Klein

For a moment permit yourself some nostalgia: go back, if you can, twenty years, and recall Dustin Hoffman's Benjamin in "The Graduate," the spaced-out, yet attractively alien Benjamin. Recall how sympathetic you felt when he watched his parents and their friends gossiping at the poolside party. Recall that Benjamin's dilemma was that, upon graduation, he didn't want to do anything, least of all to enter the phony world of his parents, typified by the advice to go into plastics from one of his father's friends. It made no sense; it was absurd; there was no meaning in convincing some poor slob that Brooks Brothers was better than Levis. Those were the insanely virtuous sixties, when young people, it seems, had heroes and when those heroes, among them John Kennedy and Martin Luther King, acted nobly.

Now, compare Benjamin to the teenager Tom Cruise plays in one of last year's top grossing films, "Risky Business." The situation of the teenager in "Risky Business," merely two decades removed from Benjamin, is different: he wants, is obsessed with getting into that materialistic adult world, and goes to extremes to do it, hiring prostitutes to offer their services to his willing friends. He will stop at nothing to get into the college of his choice. Indeed, I would venture the guess that most of our students would kill to go into plastics, if the starting pay was over twenty-five thousand.

If Tom Cruise's character is at all typical of today's youth, and I think it is, education certainly has its work cut out. If students twenty years ago retained some idealism, they also courted nihilism since they seemed to question everything; today's students, trained in compliance and reared by 20,000 hours of electronic visual and auditory images, make a contrasting error and question little. The consequences of this compliance are illustrated by a recent report in *THE BOSTON GLOBE*, the story of Harvard Professor Pat Limerick who discovered that half of all Harvard undergraduates are "phantom students, young men and women who drift through four years of college without ever grasping the full depth and richness of that experience," who "do all their course work, attend classes, take exams...but never or hardly ever have any personal contact with a real live professor." Limerick claims that "These students conducted themselves as if the university were a museum, the professors on display, the students at a distance, directing any questions to the museum's guides and guards — the graduate students." One sophomore said, "I would never go up to a man (sic) who was the expert in his field and ask him some small point."

This is not a very effective approach to the achievement of excellence, as we are reminded by *IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE*, a national best seller. Successful corporations, we find out, "turn the average Joe and the average Jane into winners. Excellent companies let, even insist that, people stick out. They accentuate the positive." Our large classes bent on feeding increasingly obsolete information to our students make it impossible for students to stick out.

The evidence is abundant that we are failing. Asked to identify great writers and thinkers who have influenced our history, students upon graduation from a four year university can typically pick out only four or five from a list of fifty and give only the vaguest identification. Asked why they are attending college, students overwhelmingly respond: "to attain job-related skills and higher salaries;" much further down on the list appear items like "to learn to think," "to develop a philosophy of life," and "to become acquainted with the great ideas." Arthur Levine's Carnegie Studies of the past several decades directly hit the mark: for today's students, dreams and heroes have died (Levine, 1980). Their attitude toward our country's future is cynical, pessimistic. The only optimism is for their own futures, and that optimism is a rather deranged one. It is a tunnel vision. Weekly, in campus and city newspapers, we see charts which remind us of the most popular rock groups, albums, singers — rarely a mention of the best selling

books. Maxine Greene reminds us that at EPCOT, the world of the future, there is no library, no bookstore.

But I am carping, as most persons will do when asked to talk about the schools, for everybody's an expert on education. So let me turn to more serious matters, some sense of remedy, of action.

I see only a few shortcomings in the Sierra Project. My major objection is the extent of its separation from the formal curriculum and the mainstream of the faculty. I am sorry that similar perspectives weren't brought to the formal curriculum, that the faculty who teach Sociology 101 and Introduction to Literature and Marketing 205 didn't also teach Survival Skills and Community Building and Conceptions of Lifestyle. In fact, those experiences might have been more effective if residence staff teamed with academics. (I am reminded of a course at Columbia Medical College, called simply "The Patient," taught by a doctor, a poet and a philosopher. Imagine the perspective on social, ethical, and psychological questions gained when more than one specialist is present!)

A second shortcoming of Sierra, alluded to in the latter chapters of John Whiteley's *CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT IN COLLEGE STUDENTS*, is the possibility of short-lived effects. In America, a colleague reminded me, when there is a problem, we throw a course at it. How can we learn to avoid this problem of oversimplifying? Sierra may be a beginning, but a strong residence hall program will not eliminate the phantom students bereft of dreams and heroes, nor will it teach students to examine ideas in the widest possible frame of reference.

In the past three decades, I believe, the most serious problem in higher education has been the erosion of liberal learning. Without a strong intellectual ethos in the formal curriculum, the gains in the informal curriculum will be lost. Whenever we assess a curriculum, whether formal or extra-curricular, it would do us well to be reminded of Charlie Brown, who quipped, "To think great thoughts, you need great food for thought." The great food for thought, of course, lies in the Great Tradition of the Western and Eastern Worlds, in the classic great books. Who can forget the image of Jacob Bronowski, at the end of both his book and film series THE ASCENT OF MAN, sifting through the ashes of Auschwitz, reminding us that the frantic intolerance and insane certainty of the Third Reich result from turning our backs on this legacy of the Great Tradition. Life-long learning, love of knowledge, a persistent habit of skepticism, a stubborn and ferocious independence of mind — these we know are the by-products of liberal learning, not the cynicism or automatic drift with any social or historical wind that comes. Except for some colleges — Eckard in Florida, Alverno in Milwaukee, Bard in New York, St. Johns, Bradford and Chicago — we see students and faculty pursuing their own most pressing impulses, paying little attention to one another.

What IS liberal learning? Just as Ralph in William Golding's *LORD OF THE FLIES* kept forgetting the reason for blowing the conch, which ultimately was survival, we forget not only the reasons for liberal education, but its very meaning. As Professor Parnell reminded us recently, the liberal arts tradition "assumes that education is more than job training — that education should place the individual in the widest possible frame of reference, so that he is in the most genuine terms a citizen of the whole planet. An uneducated person relates only to home, place of work, church and local institutions. An educated person understands the forces of history, geography, philosophy, religion, and science that have made him what he is."

I would like to think aloud about how the intentions of Sierra to build character on a base of moral and personality growth, can be applied to the formal curriculum, to the intellectual life of the student. Let me preface my remarks by saying that I am not unaware of the profound obstacles that stand in the way, indeed that character growth linked with real intellectual growth is a language foreign to many faculty and administrators. Faculty aré trained and rewarded as specialists. Nevitt Sanford reminds us that faculty attentions are too often directed not to working for our students or with our colleagues, but to our disciplinary societies, government and private foundations, agencies and other outside constituencies such as the State in order to maintain department SCHs. Just last year I was reminded that promotion would require at least five "outside" letters; colleagues new to the profession are commonly told that to survive, they had better write a major book on a major author for a major university press. With these messages pounding one's psyche, how thoroughly and generously do you think faculty will go out of their way to plan and think about their teaching?

Thus, it is clear that higher education has surrendered its integrity to "market" forces; but these forces are not the Dow-Jones thirty or the swing of the job market; they are in our midst — we have met the enemy and it is the faculty and the administration, to paraphrase both Charles Schultz and David Wee. The enemy is our free distribution system; it is our lax advising system; it is our willingness to relax prerequisites and course requirements to gain enrollments, to offer large classes near the Union at 10:30 and 11:30 because we know that that way, we can get the students. It is our urge, often unconscious, to assign little writing (certainly not a long research paper) and to use short answer exams. It is our willingness to let our students seduce us into lecture, our failure to probe our students' thoughts by talking at and not with them. It is our tendency to devalue lower division classes by assigning fifty or a hundred students to a class to buy smaller upper division and graduate classes. And yes, it is our willingness to surrender our sense of what Milton called "a full and generous education" to the dictates of our disciplinary societies and state agencies. The result of such academic entropy and sell-out should not be surprising: we can no longer be confident that the average student will be a beneficiary of liberal learning.

Combatting those forces which have been pushing education into more and more specialized corners will require a three-pronged attack:

I. Faculty development. Because most faculty are educated as specialists, they are proficient in subject matter, and not necessarily in teaching it. If Mortimer Adler is right, educating consists of three activities: presenting a coherent body of knowledge, teaching students skills by having them practice tasks, and promoting understanding by engaging students in Socratic or some less unilateral form of discussion. Faculty competence lies in the first, the lecture. They must learn to promote skills and understanding. They must learn to engage and activate students. Perhaps even more important, they must relearn much of their subject matter to understand how it can have the greatest value to students. This means that an introduction to Chemistry for the non-major would engage students in actively learning the nature of science, the skills used by the chemist for seeking truth, the methods of verification, an analysis and practice of scientific language and scientific writing, and an effective way of dealing with value questions for which the discipline offers some answers. For faculty to be general educators, there must be a vigorous faculty development program.

II. Curriculum monitoring and change. At hundreds of campuses over the past six years, general education has received a great deal of critical attention and that attention has resulted in some beneficial modifications in the distribution, content, and teaching of courses. Campuses have not been as skilled in following up such changes with monitoring and reassessment, though they must, given the inevitable regression toward the market that will occur. The academic majors and professional concentrations, where students take the great majority of their courses, also need assessment and reform. To those areas, probably the Achilles Heel of higher education, there has been little attention paid. In the majors more than in general education courses, the values of liberal education are slighted and abused. Departments should offer more courses in the major and minor, at least one lower division and one upper division course, with these characteristics:

A. Seminar size — This structural change alone could do a great deal to eliminate the phantom student, promote understanding through discussion, and personalize knowledge.

B. Integration of knowledge — The contents of the course should reach beyond the more narrow boundaries of the discipline to interdisciplinary connections. This can be done a number of ways: thematic or problem centered focus, team teaching, interdisciplinary focus, or a focus on a period of time, perhaps a century, with faculty offering different perspectives.

C. Intensive writing experiences — Given the small group size, intensive writing experiences would allow students to reflect critically as they learned and would offer instructors that chance to give individual response.

D. Goal of understanding — This means that problem solving, critical thinking, decision making and values analysis will occur, as opposed to dependence on lecture, passive student reception and lower level cognitive outcomes.

E. The great books — The student reads and discusses one or more of the great books of the field. The great works of a discipline constitute the foundation of

an intellectual community and essential building blocks of a field.

F. Library research — Research skills are critical to anyone living in an information age. One must know how to ask questions, where to go to answer them, and how to reassemble information for the audience at hand.

I was recently reminded of the danger with guidelines and lists like the one I've just given, i.e., the mistaken assumption that an administrative policy, a sleight of hand can change a curriculum. Since real educational change will occur only as the result of growth on the part of the faculty, new policies cannot be enough to effect real improvements. It would be preferable if fully qualified consultants were chosen by academic departments to work with them on program and teaching reform. That way, the essence of change would be in faculty reeducation. Thus, curriculum development must dovetail directly with faculty development.

III. Faculty reward and SCHs. Very specific rewards should be tied to implementation of liberal education goals, e.g., departments get extra operating funds when a faculty member teaches a team-taught, interdisciplinary, honors, or otherwise special course, or individual faculty receive part or full time research associateships in curriculum planning, released time, or research grants to fund expenses directly associated with a given project. The alternative is more of the same: faculty attentions focused outside their teaching. There also ought to be a strongly stated university policy that student credit hour shortages will not be used as a reason for departments to not release faculty to teach outside formal department courses.

A recent essay in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* provides an apt conclusion: "What is at issue," claims Fred Krantz, "is...where the curricular center of gravity should lie: in an approach to learning that assures that a major component of all students' work will be designed to insure" their widest possible intellectual growth; or in an approach that is "incoherently eclectic...and unashamedly opportunistic." (Krantz, 1984)

OPPORTUNITIES TO PROMOTE MORAL DEVELOPMENT: A DEAN'S PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Donald Schweingruber

I appreciate having this opportunity to respond to Dr. Whiteley's presentation about the Sierra Project and *Character Development in College Students*. I am not aware of an administrator on any campus who is called a "Dean of Character Development" but that title certainly suggests what should be central to our work in student development. Character development is the essence of the Dean of Students' work, and, in my judgment, it must be an integral part of the total educational process.

Dr. Whiteley writes that "A key purpose of higher education is the development of character." He then says, "Historically our colleges and universities have not devoted much time and effort to actual character development activities." It is my position that (a) at the kind of institution I represent, character or moral development has been a high priority activity as long as the institution has existed, and (b) regardless of the nature of the institution there are many opportunities for faculty and staff to have an impact on students' character or moral development.

Certainly, moral education activities must be a part of the formal academic programs; it must begin in the classroom because this is the heart of the educational enterprise. Yet when one considers that a student spends relatively little time in the classroom, one realizes the significance of the out-of-classroom environment and the impact that has on a student's development.

The work setting for the Dean of Students is different from the professor's typical classroom. The Dean's classroom is the campus and the greater community; there are a lot of night classes; there's considerable individual instruction; and the class is always in session.

For the past 12 years my "classroom" has been at a College that could be characterized as having the kind of environment Dr. Whiteley was trying to establish in the Sierra Project, i.e., a community where there is "the presence of high levels of trust, cooperation, and mutual feelings of security and support among the members of the community — with very low levels of alienation and hostility."

Bluffton is a Mennonite church-related college and its relationship with the chuch is a meaningful one. The influence of the church is felt on campus and the College does not take a neutral position on most questions of values and morals.

Bluffton College and many other similar institutions believe in moral education. Perhaps these kinds of institutions — small, liberal arts, private church-related — have built-in advantages in promoting moral development, but opportunities for helping students in this area are present at most colleges and universities.

Dr. Whiteley defines character education as "planned and unplanned experiences which promote the development of character in individuals."

The *planned experiences* are fairly obvious. In student affairs circles a common term is programming. We *program* in the residence halls, in student centers, in fraternity and sorority houses, and anywhere else where there are students. There are programs of all types; most are social in nature but a small percentage deal with educational, cultural, or spiritual matters. Regardless of the reason for a program, moral development can be a planned outcome. The athletic program — both intercollegiate sports and intramurals — is an ongoing activity on our campuses that provides a great opportunity for moral development. At Bluffton, activities such as the Junior Oral Program when each junior is interviewed by a panel of three faculty, the weekly forum and chapel programs, the extensive student work program, the honor system — all present opportunities for promoting moral growth.

Moral development can occur because of the *content* of these activities and, also, through the experience of rubbing shoulders with "models", i.e., people who are good examples. To paraphrase Nevitt Sanford — through these activities students can experience people who are (a) telling them what they ought to do in order to be better per-

sons, and (b) suggesting what is better.

One can list other planned activities that provide opportunities for moral development, but my experience leads me to believe that the most significant moral development results from the unplanned activities. Dr. Whiteley and others state that development comes from dissonance, and dissonance abounds in the area of the unplanned.

Any Dean of Students can identify with the following student-related problem areas — roommate conflicts, male/female relationships, depression, residence hall disturbances, alcohol and drugs, obnoxious student behaviors, and a variety of other personal concerns experienced by our students.

In all of these unplanned activities students can simply make it through and survive, or they can learn from the experience and be better prepared to confront the next problem or crisis. Whether or not moral development occurs depends in large part on how we respond to the problem. What should we be doing to promote and facilitate moral development? Let me suggest seven steps that will move us in the right direction.

1. We must create an environment on our campuses in which there is a feeling of trust and mutual respect. The environment must be of such a nature that we can, as Dr. Whiteley suggests, "balance a disequilibrating growth-producing experience with experiences promoting some security and feelings of personal belonging." There is nothing wrong with our students wanting to be secure and needed; all of us want to be needed. If moral development is to occur, the campus ought to provide a measure of security and support.
2. Faculty and staff must feel free to share their values with students, and they should be encouraged to do so. Values should not be imposed, but we also should not give the appearance of being "valueless" people. If we are to be authentic, we must share our opinions, values, and beliefs.
3. In working with students we should be as non-legalistic as possible yet still operate within the law. In the last 10-15 years colleges and universities have assumed a very legalistic stance in relating to students. This stance is a result of court decisions, new laws, and federal regulations, but unfortunately some of us have become afraid to express values, afraid to be critical, afraid to suggest what is better, and afraid to make some common-sense statements. Instead, we have compiled comprehensive legalistic documents that cover every possible kind of issue so that we can conveniently refer to a page in the rule book. Unfortunately we are living in a legalistic society, but we must not overreact to the demise of "in loco parentis." Moral development is squelched in a legalistic environment.
4. It is important that we don't protect students from the consequences of criminal behavior — that we don't condone criminal behavior and decide that we can best deal with it within the campus structure. To do so inhibits moral development. Stuart Hills says in his article "Crime and Deviance on a College Campus: The Privilege of Class" (1982) that it is a common practice for college administrators to ignore, trivialize or cover up criminal and injurious social acts engaged in by middle and upper class college students. I don't believe that this is a common practice. Certainly we should not serve as a barrier between students and civil authorities, but this does not mean that we can't support the student throughout the process. What better time than a crisis to be a facilitator of moral development?
5. Somewhat related to the last point — there is a danger, particularly at smaller institutions where one of the selling points is intensive interaction with students, of overresponding to student needs or being overly protective. We must be cautious about attempting to meet our students' every need, to make them satisfied and contented, to protect them from difficult situations, and to stamp out dissonance wherever it occurs. It is important that there not be any unhealthy over-emphasis on stability and nurturance at the risk of not allowing students to make their own decisions. We should not try to head off or solve all of the problems faced by our students. To do so doesn't allow for their moral development. Perhaps we ought to practice the art of selective negligence in this area. We can't fix everything and to attempt to do so is not being helpful to students.
6. It is not in the best interests of all our students to remain at our respective in-

stitutions. In these days of competitive recruitment and reduced enrollments it is tempting to compromise some of our principles and operate as though retention is our ultimate goal. Yes, we want to retain our students, but not at the risk of stifling their development. Sometimes the best decisions students make are decisions to leave our institutions. And sometimes the best decisions we make are when we ask students to leave. A suspension or dismissal can be a crucial, *positive* step in the development of one's moral character. In fact, the disciplinary process and the sanctions imposed by colleges should be significant contributors to moral growth; however, to be effective we must view the disciplinary function as a positive process rather than being punitive in nature.

7. Finally, regardless of the size of the institution, we must create those moments, or take advantage of those moments, when we can work with students one at a time. I would argue that opportunities for moral development among our students are greatest in one-to-one situations. Academic advising can simply be a mechanical process, or, at its best, it can be a rich opportunity for student growth. The placement office can simply provide interviewing opportunities or it can assist individual students in assessing their values, interests, and beliefs. In all of our areas, we can do the minimum and just get by or we can provide that extra — that in-depth dimension, that sharing of ourselves with individual students — that will contribute to their moral development.

One of the most exciting aspects of this process is that character development can be a mutual experience. If we challenge our students, if we are willing to take risks, if we are willing to take positions on issues, if we are willing to share our values — then not only are we promoting the moral development of our students but we are also contributing to our own development.

REFERENCES

Colby, A., Gibbs, J. C., Kohlberg, L., Speicher-Dubin, B., and Candee, D. *Standard Form Scoring Manual* (Parts 1-4). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Center for Moral Education, 1979.

Dewey, J. "The Need For a Philosophy of Education." In Archambault, R. (Ed.), *John Dewey on Education.* New York: Random House, 1964.

Gardner, J. W. *The Recovery of Confidence.* New York: Norton, 1970.

Hills, S. "Crime and Deviance on a College Campus: The Privilege of Class." *Humanity and Society,* 1982, No. 6 (August), pp. 257-266.

Kohlberg, L. "Stage and Sequence: the Cognitive-development Approach to Socialization." In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Krantz, F. "The Liberal Arts' 'Noble Vision,' Employment-Related Education, and the Free-Market Curriculum." *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 11, 1984, p. 80.

Levine, A. *When Dreams and Heroes Died.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Loevinger, J. *Ego Development: Conception and Theories.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Loevinger, J., and Wessler, R. *Measuring Ego Development,* Volume I: *Construction and Use of a Sentence Completion Test.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Loxley, J. C., and Whiteley, J. M. *Character Development in College Students,* Volume II. Character Research Press, Schenectady, New York (In Preparation).

McBee, M. L. "The Values Development Dilemma." In *Rethinking College Responsibilities for Values,* New Directions for Higher Education, No. 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Piaget, J. *The Moral Judgment of the Child.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1948. (Orginally published, 1932.)

Piaget, J. "The General Problem of the Psychobiological Development of the Child." In J. M. Tanner and B. Inhelder (Eds.), *Discussions on Child Development,* Volume 4. New York: International Universities Press, 1960.

Rest, J. R. *Development in Judging Moral Issues.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1979.

Sanford, N. "Personality Development During The College Years." *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1956, 35, pp. 74-80.

Sanford, N., and Axelrod, J. (Eds.). *College and Character.* Berkeley, CA: Montaigne, 1979.

Sprinthall, N.A., Bertin, B. B., and Whiteley, J. M. "Accomplishment After College: A Rationale for Developmental Education." *NASPA Journal,* 1982, *20,* (1), pp. 36-46.

Whiteley, J. M., and Associates. *Character Development in College Students,* Volume I. Schenectady, NY: Character Research Press, 1982.